# True Christianity

Jan Lavrinovski
All rights reserved

# Table of Contents

Knowing the Teaching and Living by It....1
What the Bible Actually Teaches....2
Compassion....2
Forgiveness....2
Humility....2
Generosity....3
Inner morality....3
Care for the vulnerable....3
Resistance to hatred....3
Criticism of wealth and worldly power....3
The Test of Practice....4
The Problem of Institutional Power....6
The Hypocrisy Problem....8
Authority and Obedience....11
The Forgotten Radicalism of Jesus....13
The Ordinary Believer....15
The Rare Genuine Practitioner....18
Ancient Philosophy's Lesson....20
The Modern World....22
Christian by Label or Christian by Conduct....24

## Knowing the Teaching and Living by It

The Bible is one of the most influential collections of writings in human history. Billions of people have been taught to regard it as a source of moral and spiritual guidance. Yet there is a simple question that is rarely examined seriously:

How many people who claim to follow its teachings actually live according to them?

It is easy to know a teaching. It is much harder to embody it.

A person can quote *"love your neighbor"* while behaving with hatred. They can preach forgiveness while seeking revenge. They can demand humility from others while considering themselves superior. They can speak about compassion for the poor while pursuing wealth and status. They can condemn the sins of others while completely ignoring their own.

This problem is not unique to Christianity. Ancient philosophical schools already recognized the enormous difference between knowing what is good and actually doing what is good. A person can possess an entire library of moral philosophy and still behave like a selfish or cruel fool.

This book therefore does not begin by asking whether Christianity is true or false. It asks something simpler:

What are the teachings actually saying, and how do the people claiming to represent them behave?

The distinction is particularly important when examining institutions. Religious authorities, governments and other powerful organizations can publicly preach morality while behaving according to completely different principles. When an institution demands humility, obedience and sacrifice from ordinary people while granting itself wealth, privilege and immunity from the same standards, its behavior deserves examination.

The Bible itself contains teachings that can be understood as genuinely valuable: compassion, forgiveness, generosity, restraint of hatred, care for vulnerable people, humility, inner morality and skepticism toward excessive attachment to wealth and status. It also contains passages concerning authority and obedience that have historically been used in very different ways.

This creates an important distinction:

The moral teaching is not necessarily the same thing as the institution claiming authority over it.

Perhaps the most useful way to read the Bible, therefore, is not to ask what label a person wears, what church they attend, or how many verses they can quote.

Ask instead:

How does this person actually live?

If someone genuinely follows the principles they preach, that is meaningful.

If someone uses those principles to control, exploit or condemn others while exempting themselves, that is hypocrisy.

And if a person has no religious belief whatsoever but lives with compassion, honesty, restraint, courage and concern for others, their conduct may be closer to the ethical teaching than that of someone loudly proclaiming themselves a believer.

This book is about that difference.

**Knowing the teaching is one thing. Living by it is another.**

## What the Bible Actually Teaches

Before judging Christianity by the behavior of churches, priests, governments or ordinary believers, it is necessary to separate the teachings of the Bible from the people who claim to represent them.

The Bible contains many different writings, authors and traditions, and its teachings are not always perfectly consistent with one another. Nevertheless, certain ethical ideas appear repeatedly and particularly strongly in the teachings attributed to Jesus.

### Compassion

The Bible repeatedly places importance on caring for people who are suffering, poor, sick, abandoned or otherwise vulnerable. Compassion is not supposed to be reserved for one's own group. The parable of the Good Samaritan is particularly striking because the person who acts morally is an outsider rather than a member of the socially respected religious group.

The lesson is simple: a person's worth is not determined by their status, nationality or group identity. What matters is how they treat another living being.

### Forgiveness

Jesus places enormous emphasis on forgiveness and rejection of endless revenge. The idea is not merely to forgive friends, but to forgive enemies and refuse to make hatred the governing principle of one's life.

This is an extraordinarily demanding teaching. It asks a person to break the cycle of injury → revenge → further injury.

But forgiveness does not necessarily mean pretending that wrongdoing did not happen. A person can recognize injustice without allowing hatred and revenge to consume their entire existence.

### Humility

Biblical teaching repeatedly warns against pride and considering oneself morally superior to others.

The person who loudly declares himself righteous while condemning everyone around him is precisely the kind of person Jesus repeatedly criticizes. Moral worth is not supposed to come from religious status, public reputation or the ability to quote scripture.

The claim to be good is worthless if one's behavior demonstrates otherwise.

### Generosity

The Bible repeatedly praises generosity and warns against allowing wealth to become the central purpose of life. Jesus' teachings about wealth are particularly uncomfortable for anyone who wants Christianity to function primarily as a justification for accumulation and status.

The question is not simply how much a person possesses, but what their possessions have turned them into.

### Inner morality

Perhaps one of the most interesting aspects of Jesus' teaching is the movement from external behavior toward inner intention.

It isn't enough merely to appear righteous. Anger, hatred, greed, lust, pride and malicious intention are themselves morally significant.

In this sense, morality is not simply:

“Did I technically obey the rule?”

It becomes:

“What kind of person am I becoming inside?”

This makes morality a matter of consciousness and character rather than merely external obedience.

### Care for the vulnerable

Widows, orphans, the poor, strangers and other vulnerable people receive repeated attention throughout biblical writings.

A society can therefore be judged by how it treats those who have the least power, rather than by how successfully its most powerful people accumulate wealth and influence.

### Resistance to hatred

The teachings attributed to Jesus contain an unusually radical rejection of hatred and retaliation. The instruction to love one's enemies is perhaps the clearest example.

This does not mean that evil or injustice must simply be accepted. Rather, it challenges the idea that becoming equally hateful toward one's enemy makes oneself morally superior.

### Criticism of wealth and worldly power

The Bible contains many warnings about wealth, status and worldly power. Jesus' statement that it is extremely difficult for a rich person to enter the Kingdom of God is hardly a celebration of material success.

The broader message is that wealth and authority can become traps when people begin to regard them as proof of their superiority or as justification for controlling others.

Taken together, these teachings present a demanding ethical ideal:

be compassionate rather than cruel, forgiving rather than vengeful, humble rather than arrogant, generous rather than greedy, concerned with inner character rather than appearances, protective of the vulnerable rather than exploitative, and skeptical of wealth and power when they become ends in themselves.

Whether one believes the Bible is divinely inspired is a separate question.

These principles can be examined on their own.

And that leads directly to the central problem of this book:

If these are the teachings, how many of the people and institutions claiming to represent them actually live by them?

## The Test of Practice

Knowing what is right and living according to what is right are two entirely different things.

A person can know every biblical teaching by heart and still behave with cruelty, greed, arrogance or hatred. They can quote scripture during an argument, attend church every Sunday, wear religious symbols and publicly proclaim their faith, while their actual conduct contradicts everything they claim to believe.

This is not a problem unique to Christianity. It is a fundamental human problem.

The ancient philosophical schools understood this distinction remarkably well. Philosophy was not supposed to be merely a collection of things one knew. It was supposed to transform the person who practiced it. Knowing that anger is destructive does nothing if one continues to become furious at every provocation. Knowing that greed is harmful does nothing if one's entire life revolves around acquiring more. Knowing that cruelty is wrong does nothing if one continues to mistreat others.

The same test can therefore be applied to Christianity.

If someone says:

“Love your neighbor.”

The question is not whether they can quote the sentence. The question is how they treat their neighbor.

If they say:

“Forgive.”

The question is whether they actually forgive when they themselves have been wronged.

If they say:

“Be humble.”

The question is whether they can admit their own mistakes.

If they say:

“Care for the poor and vulnerable.”

The question is what they actually do when confronted with a suffering person.

If they say:

“Do not judge others.”

The question is whether they spend their lives condemning everyone who thinks differently from them.

The teaching therefore becomes a test of conduct.

This distinction becomes even more important when dealing with people who possess religious authority. A priest, bishop, church leader or religious organization does not become morally good merely by possessing a title or claiming to represent God. In fact, the greater the authority a person claims, the more reasonable it is to examine whether their conduct matches the principles they preach.

A person demanding humility from others while behaving arrogantly has failed the test.

A person preaching generosity while accumulating enormous personal wealth has failed the test.

A person preaching forgiveness while constantly seeking revenge has failed the test.

A person preaching love while deliberately cultivating hatred toward outsiders has failed the test.

And a person preaching obedience while placing themselves above every moral rule has failed the test even more profoundly.

The same standard must also apply to ordinary believers. It is easy to blame institutions while imagining that ordinary people are automatically good. They are not. Human beings can use religion for comfort, identity, social status, justification or even aggression while barely practicing its ethical teachings.

This produces one of the great ironies of religion:

A person may spend their entire life learning what goodness supposedly is without becoming a good person.

Knowing the map does not mean walking the road.

Knowing the rules does not mean possessing virtue.

Knowing the Bible does not mean living biblically.

The real measure is therefore not what a person says they believe, but what they repeatedly do when nobody is watching, when they are angry, when they have power, when they encounter someone weaker than themselves, and when doing the right thing costs them something.

That is where the teaching stops being theory and becomes reality.

A moral teaching that never enters one's behavior is merely information.

## The Problem of Institutional Power

There is a fundamental danger that appears whenever moral authority becomes institutional power.

A teacher can tell people to be humble. A religious community can encourage compassion. A spiritual leader can remind people that wealth and status are temporary. But what happens when that teacher becomes the head of a powerful institution, acquires enormous wealth, receives political influence and gains the ability to command thousands or millions of people?

The situation changes completely.

Power creates distance between the person giving the orders and the person experiencing their consequences. An ordinary person who makes a mistake may harm a few people. A powerful institution can make a decision that affects entire populations while its leaders remain physically and socially protected from the consequences.

This creates an obvious temptation: to establish one set of moral expectations for those below and another for those above.

The population is told to be humble while leaders accumulate status.

The poor are told not to become obsessed with material wealth while institutions accumulate enormous wealth.

Ordinary people are told to forgive while powerful institutions may hold grudges against their opponents for generations.

People are told to obey authority while those possessing authority can place themselves beyond ordinary accountability.

At that point, the original moral teaching can become something very different from what it was intended to be.

**From spiritual teaching to institution**

The problem isn't necessarily that an institution begins with evil intentions. It can begin with a genuine desire to preserve and spread a teaching.

But institutions have their own survival mechanisms.

They need money.

They need buildings.

They need administrators.

They need hierarchy.

They need authority.

They need political relationships.

They need loyal members.

Eventually, preserving the institution itself can become more important than preserving the principles that originally created it.

A religious organization can therefore reach the strange situation where protecting its reputation becomes more important than admitting wrongdoing, protecting its hierarchy becomes more important than protecting vulnerable people, and maintaining authority becomes more important than questioning whether that authority is justified.

The institution begins to serve itself.

**Wealth changes the relationship with the teaching**

This becomes particularly uncomfortable when the teaching itself warns against excessive attachment to wealth and worldly status.

A poor spiritual teacher telling wealthy people that material possessions should not dominate their lives is one thing.

A tremendously wealthy institution telling ordinary people that they should be humble, sacrifice, give and submit is another.

The question naturally arises:

Does the moral rule apply equally to the person preaching it?

If it does not, the teaching has become hierarchical rather than universal.

The same principle applies to political power. Once religious authorities become closely connected with rulers, governments or wealthy elites, the temptation arises to protect those relationships rather than confront injustice.

A religion that originally speaks about the moral equality of human beings can become an institution organized around ranks, offices and privileges.

The spiritual ideal becomes increasingly buried underneath bureaucracy.

**Authority can corrupt the teaching**

The greatest danger is therefore not necessarily that people stop believing in morality.

It is that they continue preaching morality while using it to justify power.

“Be humble” can become a command directed downward.

“Forgive” can become a demand placed upon victims.

“Obey” can become a mechanism for protecting authority.

“Give” can become a means of enriching institutions.

“Do not judge” can become a way of discouraging criticism.

And “have faith” can become a substitute for questioning the people claiming to speak on behalf of God.

At this point, the institution may still possess the same books, symbols, ceremonies and vocabulary. But the practical function of the institution can be completely different from the ethical purpose of the original teaching.

This is why institutional behavior must be judged independently from institutional claims.

A church can call itself holy.

A government can call itself just.

A political party can call itself democratic.

A corporation can call itself ethical.

None of these descriptions prove anything.

The only meaningful test is what the institution actually does with the power it possesses.

**The final danger**

Perhaps the greatest danger of institutional power is that those at the top eventually stop seeing themselves as ordinary human beings who are subject to the same moral rules as everyone else.

They become *the authorities*.

Their decisions become unquestionable.

Their wealth becomes justified.

Their privileges become normal.

Their mistakes become someone else's fault.

Their morality becomes something they preach to other people rather than practice themselves.

And this brings us back to the fundamental principle of this book:

A teaching should be applied most strictly to those who possess the greatest power, not merely to those who possess the least.

If a moral principle is genuinely universal, it must apply to the priest and the believer, the ruler and the citizen, the wealthy and the poor, the powerful and the powerless.

Otherwise it is no longer morality.

It has become an instrument of authority.

## The Hypocrisy Problem

One of the greatest problems with any moral system appears when the people preaching it do not follow it themselves.

It is easy to tell another person how they should behave. It is much harder to impose the same standard upon oneself.

Religious hypocrisy is particularly striking because religious authorities often claim to speak on behalf of the highest possible moral authority. A priest, bishop, church leader or other religious figure may tell ordinary people to sacrifice, forgive, remain humble, reject greed and endure suffering. But if that same person lives in luxury, seeks political influence, accumulates wealth or uses their position for personal benefit, the contradiction becomes impossible to ignore.

The problem is not that a religious leader possesses material things or has a comfortable life. The problem appears when the moral rules are presented as obligations for everyone else while the person preaching them quietly creates exceptions for themselves.

The ordinary believer is told:

Give.

Sacrifice.

Forgive.

Be humble.

Do not seek revenge.

Do not become obsessed with wealth.

Obey.

Accept your suffering.

Meanwhile, the person giving these instructions may expect wealth, prestige, influence, obedience and special treatment.

This creates a two-level morality.

One morality exists for the population and another for those who possess authority.

The same contradiction can be found outside religion. Politicians can preach honesty while hiding their own corruption. Business leaders can preach responsibility while exploiting others. Public figures can demand standards from ordinary people that they themselves would never accept.

Human beings are remarkably good at finding moral principles that apply to other people while creating explanations for why those same principles should not apply to themselves.

Religion can make this problem even more powerful because the hypocrite can hide behind sacred language. Instead of saying, “Do what benefits me,” the command can be presented as coming from God, morality, tradition or some higher authority.

This makes questioning the authority itself appear immoral.

The believer who asks why the priest lives in luxury may be told that the priest's position is sacred.

The person questioning the institution's wealth may be told that they are attacking religion.

The person criticizing the ruler may be accused of being rebellious or immoral.

Thus hypocrisy can protect itself by turning criticism into a moral offense.

But there is a very simple test.

Do not listen only to what someone says.

Watch what they do when the teaching becomes personally inconvenient.

A person who preaches forgiveness after being forgiven is not being tested very much. The real test comes when they themselves are seriously wronged.

A person who praises humility while possessing nothing has little to sacrifice. The real test comes when they possess wealth and status.

A person who tells others not to seek revenge is tested when they themselves have been humiliated.

A person who tells others to give is tested by what they personally give away.

A person who tells others to obey is tested by whether they themselves accept moral rules when those rules restrict their own power.

This is why conduct is more revealing than declarations.

Someone can spend decades studying religious teachings and remain a deeply selfish person. Another person may never enter a church and nevertheless live according to principles of compassion, honesty, generosity and restraint.

The first possesses religious knowledge.

The second may possess something much more difficult: religious ethics in practice, even without the religious label.

The central problem is therefore not simply that people are imperfect. Everyone is imperfect. The deeper problem is deliberately demanding sacrifices, humility and obedience from others while quietly exempting oneself from the same requirements.

That is not merely weakness.

It is hypocrisy.

And whenever hypocrisy becomes institutionalized, morality itself can become a tool for maintaining power.

The person at the bottom is told to follow the rules.

The person at the top explains why the rules are different for him.

A genuine moral teaching should work in the opposite direction: the greater the authority and power a person possesses, the more seriously they should be required to live according to the principles they demand from everyone else.

If you cannot apply your own teaching to yourself, perhaps you never truly believed in the teaching at all.

## Authority and Obedience

The Bible contains a difficult tension when it comes to authority.

On one side, there are passages that encourage people to submit to rulers and authorities. On the other, the Bible contains numerous stories in which prophets, teachers and ordinary people challenge rulers, reject unjust commands and place a higher moral law above earthly authority.

Paul's statement in Romans 13 is one of the clearest examples of submission to government. The governing authorities are presented as having their position by divine arrangement, and Christians are instructed to submit to them.

Taken literally, this creates an obvious problem.

What happens when the authority itself becomes corrupt?

Should a person obey a ruler who commits injustice simply because that person possesses political power?

If authority automatically deserves obedience, then almost any government can use religion to justify itself. The ruler needs only to claim that obedience is a moral or divine obligation.

Yet the Bible itself contains a very different tradition.

The prophets repeatedly confront kings and rulers. They do not simply say, “The king has authority, therefore obey him.” They accuse rulers of injustice, exploitation and corruption. Their authority comes precisely from their willingness to speak against those who possess power.

Jesus himself repeatedly challenged religious authorities. He criticized people who possessed religious status while neglecting what he regarded as the more important matters of morality. He did not treat institutional position as proof of moral correctness.

There is therefore a distinction between authority and legitimacy.

A person may possess authority in the political or institutional sense while behaving unjustly. Possessing the ability to command people does not automatically make the command morally right.

This creates a much more interesting interpretation of obedience.

Perhaps the biblical teaching should not simply be understood as:

“Obey whoever possesses power.”

Instead, the tension within the Bible allows another principle:

“Do not create unnecessary disorder, but do not confuse earthly authority with absolute moral authority.”

That distinction becomes especially important when institutions demand obedience while acting contrary to the very morality they claim to represent.

If a government orders injustice, does obedience become virtuous merely because the order came from a government?

If a religious authority demands something immoral, does its title make the command moral?

If a ruler becomes corrupt, does his position make him righteous?

Obviously not.

The existence of authority and the existence of moral truth are two different things.

This is also where the biblical stories of resistance become important. The Hebrew prophets did not merely comfort ordinary people while leaving rulers untouched. They confronted kings. They condemned exploitation. They spoke against injustice even when doing so was dangerous.

That creates a powerful counterweight to the passages emphasizing obedience.

The Bible therefore contains both traditions: submission to authority and resistance to corrupt authority.

Which tradition becomes dominant can depend enormously on who is interpreting the text.

A ruler will naturally prefer the passages telling people to obey.

A revolutionary will naturally prefer the passages describing resistance.

A religious institution may emphasize obedience.

A dissident may emphasize the prophets.

This is why simply saying “the Bible says obey authority” gives an incomplete picture.

The deeper question is whether authority itself is subject to morality.

If ordinary people are required to obey moral rules while rulers are permitted to violate them, then morality becomes nothing more than a tool of power.

But if the ruler is subject to the same moral law as everyone else, then authority becomes a responsibility rather than a privilege.

The person with the greatest power should arguably face the greatest moral obligation.

This returns us to the central principle of this book.

Do not judge morality by who possesses the title.

Judge it by conduct.

A king can be unjust.

A priest can be corrupt.

A government can be oppressive.

A religious institution can become hypocritical.

And an ordinary person with no position whatsoever can possess greater moral integrity than all of them.

Authority therefore deserves neither automatic worship nor automatic hatred.

It deserves examination.

The question should always be:

What are you doing with the power you possess?

If your authority makes you more compassionate, more responsible and more concerned for others, it may be serving a legitimate purpose.

If it makes you arrogant, wealthy, violent and unaccountable, then the authority itself has become part of the problem.

## The Forgotten Radicalism of Jesus

Before Christianity became an enormous institution with churches, hierarchies, political influence, wealth and centuries of theological arguments, there was a teacher walking among ordinary people and speaking about how a human being should live.

Whatever one believes about Jesus' divine nature, the ethical teachings attributed to him contain ideas that were remarkably demanding.

He did not simply tell people to behave well when it was convenient. He demanded that they reconsider their relationship with enemies, wealth, status, revenge, judgment and authority.

“Love your enemies” is not an easy instruction.

Neither is forgiving someone who has genuinely harmed you.

Neither is giving to those in need without expecting something in return.

Neither is refusing to make wealth the purpose of existence.

Neither is examining one's own faults before concentrating on the faults of others.

These teachings become particularly radical when applied consistently.

Imagine a society in which people genuinely refused to cultivate hatred toward their enemies, genuinely cared for the poor, genuinely restrained their desire for revenge, genuinely rejected arrogance and genuinely regarded wealth and status as secondary to moral character.

Such a society would look very different from one in which people constantly compete for power, wealth and social superiority.

Jesus' teaching also repeatedly moves attention away from external religious appearance and toward the individual person's inner condition.

A person can appear righteous while being filled with hatred.

A person can perform religious rituals while behaving cruelly.

A person can publicly declare themselves holy while privately being greedy and dishonest.

The external appearance therefore means very little if the inner character remains unchanged.

This is perhaps one of the most important aspects of the teaching: morality is not merely about following visible rules. It concerns what is happening inside the person.

That makes the teaching much closer to a philosophy of inner transformation than to simply belonging to an institution.

Yet this is precisely where the later history of Christianity becomes complicated.

The original teachings became surrounded by enormous institutional structures. Churches developed hierarchies, offices, doctrines, political relationships, wealth and systems of authority. Over centuries, Christianity became not merely a spiritual teaching but also a social and political institution.

The danger is that the institution can gradually become more important than the transformation of the individual.

The cross becomes a symbol.

The church becomes an institution.

The priest becomes an authority.

The doctrine becomes a requirement.

The ceremony becomes an obligation.

And the original question—“What kind of human being are you becoming?”—can become secondary.

This does not mean that everything that developed after Jesus was necessarily worthless. Nor does it mean that every Christian institution or believer abandoned his teachings. It means that the teachings themselves should not automatically be confused with everything later done in their name.

Jesus can therefore be examined independently of the institutions that came afterward.

What happens when we remove the buildings, titles, political power, wealth and religious hierarchy?

We are left with a human being teaching people how to treat other human beings.

Forgive.

Do not live through hatred.

Do not make wealth your master.

Care for those who suffer.

Do not consider yourself superior.

Examine yourself.

Do good without demanding applause.

Love even when hatred would be easier.

And perhaps most importantly, do not assume that possessing religious authority makes you morally superior.

These principles do not require a church building.

They do not require a bishop.

They do not require political power.

They do not even necessarily require someone to call themselves a Christian.

A person can reject Christianity as an institution while still recognizing value in some of the ethical teachings attributed to Jesus.

Likewise, a person can call themselves a Christian while completely failing to live according to those teachings.

This is why the distinction between Jesus' teachings and institutional Christianity matters.

The question is not simply whether Christianity survived.

It clearly did.

The more difficult question is:

How much of the radical ethical teaching survived in the people and institutions claiming to represent it?

A religion can preserve the words of a teacher for two thousand years while simultaneously failing to preserve the way of life those words demanded.

The words remain.

The question is whether anyone actually lives them.

## The Ordinary Believer

The ordinary Christian is often placed in an uncomfortable position between the teachings of the Bible and the institutions that claim to represent those teachings.

Many people identify as Christian because they were born into a Christian family, grew up in a Christian country, were baptized as children, attended

church, or simply inherited Christianity as part of their culture. For some, Christianity is primarily an identity rather than a consciously practiced philosophy of life.

There is nothing unusual about this. Human beings inherit languages, customs, national identities and traditions in exactly the same way. Religion is often inherited before it is examined.

A person can therefore sincerely call themselves Christian without having seriously studied what Christianity actually asks of them.

They may know the familiar stories.

They may know some prayers.

They may attend church occasionally.

They may possess a cross.

They may believe that Jesus was important.

But none of these things necessarily demonstrate that the person is actually practicing Christian ethics.

The real test begins when the teaching becomes inconvenient.

What happens when someone insults them?

Can they restrain their hatred?

What happens when somebody hurts them?

Can they forgive?

What happens when they encounter a poor or suffering person?

Do they help?

What happens when they have an opportunity to gain something through dishonesty?

Do they refuse?

What happens when they encounter someone they consider inferior?

Do they treat that person with dignity?

What happens when their own political or religious group behaves badly?

Do they criticize their own side, or immediately defend it?

These questions reveal considerably more about a person's moral life than their religious label.

There is also a psychological reason why people may prefer the identity of Christianity to the practice of Christianity.

Identity is easy.

Practice is difficult.

It is easy to say, “I am Christian.”

It is considerably harder to live every day according to forgiveness, humility, generosity, compassion and restraint.

It is easy to condemn another person's sins.

It is harder to examine your own behavior.

It is easy to quote a biblical passage proving that somebody else is wrong.

It is harder to remain calm and compassionate when somebody attacks you personally.

This is where religion can become a form of social identity rather than moral transformation.

A person may defend Christianity aggressively while behaving in ways completely contrary to the teachings attributed to Jesus.

They may hate atheists while being unable to demonstrate compassion.

They may condemn other religions while behaving arrogantly toward their own neighbors.

They may demand moral standards from strangers while excusing the same behavior among friends and political allies.

They may loudly proclaim the Bible while barely practicing its most difficult teachings.

This does not mean that Christians are uniquely hypocritical. Human beings do this with practically every ideology. Political people defend their own side, nationalists defend their nation, atheists can behave irrationally, philosophers can fail to live philosophically, and people who preach kindness can behave cruelly.

The problem is human inconsistency.

But Christianity creates an especially interesting situation because it possesses such a strong emphasis on inner moral transformation. If the central teacher says that one's inner character matters, then merely carrying the label “Christian” becomes almost meaningless.

The question becomes much simpler:

Are you actually becoming the kind of person your teachings describe?

A person who calls themselves Christian but lives with constant hatred, greed, cruelty and arrogance may possess the Christian identity without possessing much of the Christian ethic.

Conversely, a person who rejects Christianity entirely but genuinely practices compassion, forgiveness, humility and concern for suffering people may be living closer to certain Christian ethical ideals than many people who proudly call themselves Christians.

This is why the number of Christians in the world tells us very little about how much Christianity is actually being practiced.

Millions of people can belong to a religion.

Millions can attend ceremonies.

Millions can carry religious symbols.

Millions can call themselves believers.

Yet the actual practice of the moral teaching may remain rare.

The difference between the two is enormous.

A believer is someone who says they believe.

A practitioner is someone whose behavior demonstrates what they believe.

And ultimately, when judging a moral philosophy, the second is far more interesting than the first.

**The world does not need more people who can identify themselves as Christians. It needs more people who actually attempt to live according to the best principles they claim to believe.**

## The Rare Genuine Practitioner

There is an important distinction between believing in a moral teaching and actually attempting to live according to it.

The genuine practitioner is not necessarily the person who speaks the most about religion. They may not even consider themselves religious at all. What distinguishes them is their conduct.

They try to be compassionate because they believe compassion is good.

They forgive because they understand that endless hatred destroys the person carrying it.

They try to be honest even when dishonesty would benefit them.

They restrain themselves when they are angry.

They help someone who is suffering without immediately asking what they will receive in return.

They examine their own behavior instead of automatically blaming everyone else.

They do not need a religious institution standing behind them in order to behave decently.

This person may be a Christian. They may be a Buddhist, a Stoic, a pagan, an atheist or nothing that can easily be placed into a religious category. The label is secondary. The conduct is what matters.

A person who has never opened the Bible but genuinely lives according to compassion, humility, generosity and restraint may be closer to the ethical ideal expressed in parts of the Bible than someone who has memorized every verse but treats other people with contempt.

This is where the difference between knowledge and wisdom becomes visible.

Knowledge tells a person what the teaching says.

Wisdom begins when the person actually changes their behavior because of it.

The genuine practitioner therefore does not need to constantly announce that they are good. Their conduct demonstrates it.

They do not necessarily preach forgiveness. They forgive.

They do not constantly talk about humility. They can admit when they are wrong.

They do not boast about generosity. They quietly help.

They do not demand that everyone else follow moral rules. They begin by applying those rules to themselves.

They do not consider themselves morally superior simply because they belong to the correct religion or philosophical school.

In fact, genuine practice may often look remarkably ordinary. There may be no dramatic religious ceremonies, no public declarations and no great institution involved. It may simply consist of how a person behaves toward an animal, a stranger, a weaker person, an enemy or someone who cannot offer them anything in return.

This is also why genuine practitioners may be difficult to recognize.

A hypocrite has an incentive to display their morality because morality gives them status.

A genuine practitioner may have no such incentive.

They can do good without anyone knowing.

They can refuse cruelty without receiving praise.

They can forgive without telling everyone that they have forgiven.

They can live modestly without making their modesty into a performance.

Perhaps this is one of the greatest ironies of institutional religion: the person who most loudly identifies themselves as righteous may be less morally transformed than the quiet person who simply tries to live decently.

The genuine practitioner also understands that perfection is impossible.

Following a moral philosophy does not mean never becoming angry, never making mistakes or never behaving selfishly. It means recognizing those failures and attempting to correct them.

The difference is therefore not between perfect people and imperfect people.

It is between people who sincerely attempt to improve themselves and people who use morality primarily to judge others.

A genuine practitioner asks:

“Am I becoming a better human being?”

A hypocrite asks:

“Why aren't other people behaving according to my rules?”

That distinction can exist within every religion and outside every religion.

The world may therefore contain far more people who are capable of recognizing moral teachings than people who consistently embody them.

The rare person who actually tries to live according to the best principles they have discovered is perhaps more valuable than thousands who merely repeat those principles.

The teaching becomes real only when it enters the life of the person who has learned it.

**A good philosophy is not demonstrated by how many people believe it. It is demonstrated by what happens to the person who genuinely practices it.**

## Ancient Philosophy's Lesson

The ancient philosophers understood something that modern people often forget: philosophy is not primarily about collecting ideas. It is about changing the way one lives.

The Stoics did not regard philosophy as an academic subject that existed only in books. A person could know everything about Stoic teachings and still fail completely if they became consumed by anger, fear, greed or vanity.

Epictetus repeatedly returned to this distinction. It is one thing to be able to explain philosophical principles; it is another to actually use them when life becomes difficult.

If someone says that external possessions are not the most important things in life, the real test comes when they lose something valuable.

If someone says that other people's opinions should not control them, the test comes when they are insulted.

If someone says that anger should be controlled, the test comes when somebody deliberately provokes them.

The philosophy becomes real only when the situation becomes difficult.

The Cynics took this even further. They rejected the pursuit of wealth, status, luxury and social approval and attempted to live according to what they considered natural and rational principles. Diogenes is perhaps the most famous example. He deliberately lived in extreme simplicity and openly mocked social conventions and people who possessed enormous status but little character.

His message was essentially that a person should not become a slave to things that society tells them they need.

Possessions, reputation, titles, political status and social approval can all become forms of psychological dependence.

The Cynic therefore asked a very uncomfortable question:

“If you claim that you are free, why can other people's opinions control your behavior?”

This is remarkably close to the problem examined throughout this book.

A person can know that greed is destructive while spending their entire life accumulating possessions.

They can know that social status is temporary while desperately seeking recognition.

They can know that anger destroys peace while becoming furious over every insult.

They can know that death is inevitable while living entirely through fear of it.

They can know philosophical principles while remaining completely unchanged.

This is why the ancient schools often treated philosophy almost like training.

You do not become physically strong by reading about exercise.

You do not become musically skilled by reading about music.

And you do not become wise simply by reading about wisdom.

Practice is required.

The same principle applies to religion.

A person can read the Bible every day and remain cruel.

A person can memorize Buddhist teachings and remain consumed by hatred.

A person can study Stoicism and still collapse whenever something goes against their wishes.

The problem is not necessarily that the teaching is false.

The person simply has not transformed knowledge into practice.

This is perhaps one of the most valuable lessons that can be taken from ancient philosophy: stop asking only what a person believes and start asking what their beliefs actually do to them.

Does the philosophy make them calmer?

More courageous?

Less greedy?

Less dependent on approval?

More compassionate?

More capable of enduring suffering?

More honest with themselves?

More independent from social pressure?

If the answer is no, then perhaps the philosophy exists only in their head.

The ancient philosophers therefore provide a useful standard for everything discussed in this book.

A teaching should not be judged solely by its words.

It should be judged by the person who attempts to live according to it.

The real philosopher is not the person who can give the most impressive lecture about virtue.

It is the person who still attempts to practice virtue when nobody is watching and when doing so is difficult.

The same can be said of the genuine Christian, Buddhist, pagan, atheist or follower of any other philosophy.

**The purpose of wisdom is not to know how one should live. It is to actually live that way.**

## The Modern World

The modern world presents us with an enormous contradiction: never before has humanity possessed so much moral language, yet the existence of moral language does not mean that morality actually governs human behavior.

Governments speak about peace while maintaining enormous military forces and participating in wars. They speak about human rights while those rights can become secondary when political or economic interests are involved. They speak about justice while different people can experience the law very differently depending on their wealth, position and connections.

Corporations speak about responsibility, sustainability and concern for people while their fundamental purpose is generally to generate profit. Some genuinely attempt to behave responsibly, but the economic structure itself creates a constant temptation to put financial interests above human or environmental concerns.

Religious institutions speak about compassion, humility, charity and spiritual values while some accumulate wealth, maintain elaborate hierarchies and become closely connected with political and economic power. Again, individual members may sincerely live according to their teachings, but the behavior of an institution can be very different from the ideals it publicly promotes.

Political parties promise to represent ordinary people while competing for power and influence. They encourage populations to identify with opposing camps, and ordinary people can end up hating one another over political identities while the political system itself continues operating largely beyond their individual control.

The same contradiction exists among ordinary people.

People demand honesty while lying.

They demand loyalty while betraying others.

They condemn greed while wanting more for themselves.

They condemn violence while becoming enthusiastic when violence is directed against an enemy.

They demand tolerance for their own beliefs while showing no tolerance toward beliefs they dislike.

They demand justice when they are victims and excuses when their own side is responsible.

This does not mean that every government, corporation, church or individual is equally corrupt. There are honest politicians, ethical businesses, sincere religious practitioners and ordinary people who genuinely try to behave well.

The problem is that the existence of good individuals does not automatically make an institution good.

An institution should be judged by its actual behavior, particularly when its interests conflict with the principles it claims to uphold.

This is why moral language alone should never be sufficient.

A government saying that it represents freedom does not prove that it protects freedom.

A church saying that it represents compassion does not prove that it behaves compassionately.

A corporation saying that it cares about people does not prove that people come before profit.

A political movement saying that it represents justice does not prove that it behaves justly.

Words are cheap.

Institutions should therefore be judged by what they do when they possess power and when nobody can easily stop them.

The same standard should be applied to ordinary people. It is easy to imagine oneself as a good person when nothing difficult is being demanded. The real test comes when morality conflicts with personal advantage.

Would you tell the truth if lying benefited you?

Would you help someone who could give you nothing in return?

Would you criticize your own political or religious side when it behaved badly?

Would you refuse to participate in cruelty when everyone around you considered it acceptable?

Would you apply the same moral standard to your enemy that you apply to yourself?

These questions reveal much more than declarations of belief.

The modern world therefore does not suffer from a shortage of moral teachings. There are already thousands of books, religions, philosophies, laws and political declarations telling humanity what supposedly constitutes good behavior.

The problem is the enormous distance between the teaching and the practice.

Humanity has learned how to speak beautifully about morality.

It has not necessarily learned how to live by it.

Perhaps the most important lesson is therefore to stop being impressed by moral language alone.

Watch the behavior.

Watch what happens when people obtain money.

Watch what happens when they obtain power.

Watch what happens when they encounter someone weaker than themselves.

Watch what happens when their interests are threatened.

That is where proclaimed morality meets reality.

And that is where we discover whether the teaching was genuine—or merely another set of words.

## Christian by Label or Christian by Conduct

At the end of all this, perhaps the simplest distinction is also the most important:

There is a difference between being Christian by label and being Christian by conduct.

A label requires very little. A person can call themselves Christian because they were baptized, because their parents were Christian, because they attend church, because they believe in Jesus, or because Christianity is part of their cultural identity.

But conduct requires something much more difficult.

If Christianity teaches forgiveness, then the Christian by conduct attempts to forgive.

If it teaches compassion, they attempt to be compassionate.

If it teaches humility, they attempt to restrain their pride.

If it teaches generosity, they give.

If it teaches care for the vulnerable, they help those who are suffering.

If it teaches resistance to hatred, they attempt not to become consumed by hatred.

If it criticizes wealth and status, they do not make wealth and status the purpose of their existence.

If it teaches examination of oneself, they look at their own failures before searching for the failures of everyone else.

The genuine follower therefore does not need to constantly announce that they are Christian. Their behavior should make the claim visible.

This also means that the number of people who identify as Christian tells us very little about how many people actually practice Christian ethics.

Millions can carry the name.

Millions can attend churches.

Millions can quote scripture.

Millions can argue that they are defending Christianity.

Yet the actual practice of its most demanding teachings may be considerably rarer.

The same principle applies to religious institutions. A church does not become morally good merely because it calls itself Christian. A priest does not become virtuous merely because he wears religious clothing. A religious leader does not become trustworthy merely because people call him holy.

The greater the authority, the greater the responsibility to demonstrate the principles being preached.

And this standard should not be used only against Christians.

The atheist who speaks about rationality but behaves irrationally has the same problem.

The Stoic who preaches self-control but is ruled by anger has the same problem.

The politician who speaks about justice but acts corruptly has the same problem.

The person who speaks about freedom while demanding obedience has the same problem.

The universal test is simple:

Do you actually live according to what you claim to believe?

This is why a person who has never called themselves Christian may sometimes demonstrate more of the ethical spirit attributed to Jesus than someone who loudly identifies themselves as a Christian.

The label is external.

Conduct is internal.

A declaration tells us what a person wants others to believe about them.

Their behavior tells us considerably more about who they actually are.

Perhaps Christianity would therefore be better measured not by the number of people who call themselves Christians, but by the number of people who genuinely attempt to live according to its highest ethical principles.

And perhaps this is true of every philosophy and every religion.

The world does not need more people collecting moral labels.

It needs people practicing the morality behind them.

In the end, the question is not:

“Are you Christian?”

The more meaningful question is:

**“How do you live?”**

That is where every teaching ultimately has to prove itself.

- 